

his Master, and say, I and my fathers have held him in bondage for more than four hundred years. Now, I think, as a rule and principle in common law, four hundred years would establish anything.

Now, suppose that was true; what was the direct act of Almighty God there? He choose to send an abolitionist after them, to bring them up out of the country. How did he do it? Was there an act of emancipation, or an act of compensation, by either the general or the provincial government of Egypt? I never heard of such a thing in my life. But the Almighty, the abolitionist in that case, not only determined that the Egyptians should give up their slaves, themselves, their wives and their little ones, without giving Pharaoh and the rest of the Egyptians anything for them, but the Lord determined as an act of justice to the Hebrews that they should not go up out of that land empty-handed. What did he say to them? He said—You have been building up stores and treasures, and all this and that for this people, and they have not paid you except in harshness and oppression; therefore, go to these slaveholding Egyptians and borrow of them jewels for yourselves and your wives; get their gold and silver, if you can; then be ready. Kill the Paschal lamb just at twelve o'clock, and I will be ready for you. And I believe there were as many slaves in Egypt at that time as there are in the whole of the United States. In that company of fugitives that went out of Egypt there were 600,000 men, besides an innumerable company of women and children. Taking the 600,000 men as the basis of calculation, and how many slaves were manumitted by that ordinance of the Lord? Not less than 3,000,000, of course. And they did not go out empty-handed. Where was the principle of justice in that? Why did the Supreme Lord of the Universe say to them—Go to the Egyptians and borrow of them gold and silver, and jewels? Because He knew that for more than four hundred years they had been working for hard task-masters, and the Lord determined that they should not go up out of Egypt without some compensation. The good Lord was on the right side of the question of emancipation; he was for compensating the slaves instead of the owners. I say that is a good precedent. If you do all that the good Master does and tells you to do, you will be right. He was an emancipationist, and He was a compensationist, but on the side of the slave.

I say, then, reducing this down to a plain, common-sense matter, you have no right to make the artizan, the mechanic, the merchant, or any other class in Maryland, who never held slaves, turn around and pay the slaveowner for the slave, when the owner has had all the benefit of slavery for generations, and when slavery has rested upon the workingman as a great curse and incubus all

this time. It is for this reason that the non-slaveholding men in this State, who have suffered under this institution, are not the men to pay the slaveholders for their slaves. And, therefore, I am opposed to compensation.

I am in favor of emancipation because I think that rebellion has made it imperative upon us. I am in favor of emancipation because I think the circumstances surrounding us render it imperative upon us. And I am opposed to compensation by the non-slaveholders of the State, because I believe that all the generations of slaveholders who have held slaves in this State, have held them to the public prejudice; that in so far as Maryland was a slaveholding State, that "institution" as they call it, helped to depress the non-slaveholding classes of every description, professional, mercantile, mechanical, common day laborers. Every class of men who were non-slaveholders have felt for generations the baneful effects of this system. Then why should they pay for its destruction? What good rule is there for that? I am opposed to it.

And I am for acting upon this question of compensation now. It does not happen to be the exact fact, as gentlemen say, that this question was not before the people. I know that wherever I went, and wherever any of the gentlemen went whom I have heard talk upon the subject, the great question before the people was, compensation or no compensation. In the county which I have the honor to represent (Howard,) a vote was cast against the convention by one majority. And yet for members of this convention a vote of one hundred average majority was cast for the so-called radical candidates. Now what explanation do gentlemen give of that fact? I assure them this is the explanation; numbers of people who were radical enough and wanted slavery out of the way, were frightened into voting against a convention, because they were told by the secessionists of the county that if there was a convention the condition of compensation by the State would be inevitably attached to emancipation. And as they dreaded this, many of them voted against having a convention; but by their vote upon members for the convention, they showed conclusively that if there was to be a convention they wanted radical men and anti-State emancipationists to represent them here. That is the fact.

This question of emancipation has been before the people. I would like, if it was exactly in place here—I will hand it to my friends, and they can read it privately if they please—I would like to read one of many letters I have received, to show them the sentiment daily coming upon this subject to members here, in regard to compensation. My friend from Somerset (Mr. Jones) made the point that my friend from Frederick (Mr. Schley) and myself were very anxious that